UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,058	04/27/2005	Mihai Adrian Tiberiu Sanduleanu	NL02 1079 US	9258
65913 NXP, B.V.	7590 11/17/200	EXAMINER		
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY DRIVE			PEREZ, JAMES M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN JOSE, CA	A 95131	2611		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/17/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/533,058		SANDULEANU, MIHAI ADRIAN TIBERIU		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	JAMES M. PEREZ	2611		

	JAMES M. PEREZ	2611					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 29 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidated al (with appeal fee) in compliance	f Appeal. To avoid abar vit, or other evidence, w e with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request				
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is leading to the final rejection. 							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (l	iter than SIX MONTHS from the maili b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	ng date of the final rejection	on.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee							
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	hortened statutory period for reply ori	ginally set in the final Offic	ce action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	,	TE below);					
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better 	•	educina or simplifyina tl	he issues for				
appeal; and/or			10 133463 101				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally re	jected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	M. O W. at. I.N. at at. No	- 1 (A) . (7)	DTOL 004)				
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		ompliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided.		rill be entered and an e	xplanation of				
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>8 and 9</u> .							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:							
See Continuation Sheet.							
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	P10/58/08) Paper No(s)						
/Shuwang Liu/	/James M Perez/						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611	Examiner, Art Unit 261	1					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- 1. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 2. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).
- 3. The applicant argues that the cited phase detector in claim 1 of the final office action mailed on 7/14/2008 does not meet the limitations of a phase detector.

Moser (USPN 6,853,696) teaches... "a phase detector (fig. 2: elements 38, and 34a,b: col. 7, line 36 through col. 8, line 25) controlled by a first signal provided by the first multiplexer and by a second signal provided by the second multiplexer (elements 38, and 34a,b: col. 7, line 36 through col. 8, line 25).

The examiner will now further explain the rejection of Claim 1.

Moser further discloses that the FQ1 and FQ2 gives correlative information about the phase relationship between the data signal and VCO (fig. 2: col. 8, lines 42-44: wherein FQ1 and FQ2 are inputs to elements 38, and 34a,b), wherein said circuits are used to generate output signals OUT+ and OUT-, which represent ΔfDV (fig. 2: elements OUT+, OUT-, 34a,b and 38: col. 7, lines 17-21) wherein when ΔfDV equals zero, indicates that a phase lock has been achieved (col. 9, lines 7-10). Thus the rejection of clam 1 is under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of Moser (USPN 6,853,696) in view of Savoj in the Final Office Action mailed on 7/14/2008 is proper.

4. All other arguments are address in said Final Office Action...